

REMARKS

Claims 1-28 and 30-32 are pending. Claims 2-10, 22 and 30-31 stand objected to but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form, and claims 1, 11-21, 23-28 and 32 stand rejected. By this Amendment, claim 29 has been cancelled, claims 2, 9, 22 and 30 have been rewritten into independent form, claim 10 has been rewritten to depend on claim 9, claims 31 and 32 have been rewritten to depend on claim 30, and claims 1 and 21 have been amended.

1. The Office Action indicates that claims 2-10, 22, 30 and 31 are objected to as being dependent on a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 2 has been rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1, and claims 3-8 depend directly on claim 2. Claim 9 has been rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1, and claim 10 has been rewritten to depend directly on claim 9. Claim 22 has been rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 1 and intervening claim 21. With respect to claim 22, the Office Action asserts that “the compression ratio” and “the expansion ratio” has insufficient antecedent basis for these limitations, and claim 22 has been further amended to change “the compression ratio” and “the expansion ratio” to “a compression ratio” and “an expansion ratio.” Claim 30 has been rewritten into independent form including all of the limitations of base claim 29, and claim 31 has been rewritten to depend directly on claim 30.

Accordingly, withdrawal of the objection to claims 2-10, 22, 30 and 31 are earnestly solicited.

2. The Office Action rejects claims 1, 11-21, 24-27 and 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (USPN 5,640,018). Claim 29 is no longer pending. If applicable to present claims 1, 11-21 and 24-27, this rejection is respectfully traversed. For at least the following reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 1, 11-21 and 24-27 is respectfully solicited.

“A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claims is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference.” *Verdegaal Bros. v.*

Union Oil Co. of California, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). “The identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in the ... claim.” *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 USPQ2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989).

A. With respect to claims 1 and 11-20, Suzuki et al. does not disclose an apparatus with a bundle of optical fibers that defines first and second end planes where:

the first and second end planes intersect at an intersection line;

an orthogonal plane is defined orthogonal to a fiber direction of the bundle of optical fibers;

the orthogonal plane intersects the intersection line at only one point;

as specified in claim 1, and therefore contained in claims 11-20 dependent on claim 1.

B. Claim 21 has been rewritten into independent form and amended to further specify the first and second formats. With respect to claims 21 and 24-27, Suzuki et al. does not disclose an apparatus that includes a bundle of optical fibers with first and second ends where:

the bundle of optical fibers is capable of morphing a first rectangular format image at the first end into a second rectangular format image at the second end, the first rectangular format image having an aspect ratio different than an aspect ratio of the second rectangular format image

as specified in claim 21, and therefore contained in claims 24-27 dependent on claim 21. Suzuki et al. does not disclose a fiber block capable of morphing a first format into a second format.

3. The Office Action rejects claims 23 and 28 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (USPN 5,640,018) in view of Sugawara et al. (USPN 5,550,380). If applicable to the present claims, this rejection is respectfully traversed. For at least the following reasons, withdrawal of the rejections of claims 23 and 28 is respectfully solicited.

As discussed above, claim 21 has been rewritten into independent form and amended to further specify the first and second formats. With respect to claims 23 and 28, Suzuki et al. in view of Sugawara et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest an apparatus that includes a bundle of optical fibers with first and second ends where:

the bundle of optical fibers is capable of morphing a first rectangular format image at the first end into a second rectangular format image at the second end, the first rectangular format image having an aspect ratio different than an aspect ratio of the second rectangular format image

as specified in claim 21, and therefore contained in claims 23 and 28 dependent on claim 21. As discussed above with respect to the rejection of claim 21, Suzuki et al. does not disclose a fiber block capable of morphing a first format into a second format. Furthermore, Sugawara et al. does not provide the disclosure deficiency of Suzuki et al. Accordingly, Suzuki et al. in view of Sugawara et al. does not disclose, teach or suggest the apparatus specified by either claim 23 or claim 28.

4. The Office Action rejects claim 32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al. (USPN 5,640,018) in view of Sugawara et al. (USPN 5,550,380). If applicable to the present claim, this rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 32 has been rewritten into a form that depends on claim 30 instead of claim 29. The Office Action already indicated that claim 30 specifies allowable subject matter. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection of claim 32 is respectfully solicited.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. Prompt reconsideration and allowance are earnestly solicited. Should the examiner believe that any further action is necessary to place the application in condition for allowance, the examiner is invited to contact the under signed at the telephone number listed below.

It is believed that no additional fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper and concurrently filed papers, if any. However, should a fee be due (or an overpayment be made),

the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fee (or credit any overpayment) associated with this filing to Deposit Account No. 04-1425.

Respectfully submitted,
DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP

A handwritten signature in black ink, reading "Daniel E. Fisher". The signature is written in a cursive style with a large, looped 'D' and a stylized 'F'.

by Daniel E. Fisher
Registration No. 34,162
Telephone No. (202) 442-3000

Date:

4/14/04

DEF:

DORSEY & WHITNEY LLP
Suite 400 South
1001 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20004
Telephone: 202-442-3000
Facsimile: 202-442-3199